## REMARKS

These amendments and remarks are responsive to the non-final Office Action issued on July 2, 2007. By this Response, claim 2 is cancelled without prejudice, and claims 1, 3, 4, 7-9 and 14-18 are amended. No new matter is added. Claims 1 and 3-18 are now active for examination. A petition for a one-month extension of time is submitted concurrently herewith.

### The Office Action

The Office Action rejects claims 7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto (U.S. Patent No. 5,784,059) in view of Damiani (U.S. Patent No. 6,667,726). Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto in view of Damiani and Oishi (U.S. Patent No. 4,058,796). Claims 8 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto in view of Damiani and Entenmann.

### The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112, Second Paragraph Are Overcome

Claims 7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. By this Response, claims 7 and 14-17 are amended to improve wording. It is submitted that the rejections of claims 7 and 14-17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph are overcome.

### The Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Are Overcome

Claims 1-5, 9-10, 12-13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Morimoto in view of Damiani. By this Response, independent claims 1 and 18 are amended.

It is submitted that the combination of Morimoto and Damiani fails to meet every limitation of the claims.

For example, claim 1, as amended, describes a display system (S1, S2) for a vehicle that provides a dynamic alternation to menus displayed to a driver according to driving load on the driver. For instance, a menu with less tiers of selections is displayed with the driver is driving. The system includes a driving load determination unit (14, 15, 16) which determines a driving load on a user who drives the vehicle, and a display control unit (12, 13, 15,111) which determines the operation menu to be displayed on the screen, using first menu information or second menu information having a less number of tiers comparing to the first menu information, according to the driving load on the user. The display control unit determines, based upon an operation of the user in inputting command, a timing to shift from a process of displaying the operation menu using the first menu information to a process of displaying the operation menu using the second menu information.

The Office Action correctly acknowledged that Morimoto fails to disclose a driving load determination unit that determines a driving load on the user. Furthermore, as Morimoto does not determine a driving load on the user, Morimoto also fails to teach determining an operation menu to be displayed on the screen, using first menu information or second menu information having a less number of tiers comparing to the first menu information, according to the driving load on the user, as described in claim 1. Moreover, Morimoto fails to disclose a display control unit that **determines, based upon the operation of the user in inputting command, a timing to shift** from a process of displaying the operation menu using the first menu information to a process of displaying the operation menu using the second menu information.

The other cited document, Damiani, does not alleviate the deficiencies of Morimoto. While Damiani describes a processing unit 7 that enables/disables representations of predetermined operations performed by the driver according to the speed of the vehicle, the enablement and disablement of the representations are mere mechanical switches between display statuses according to a driving condition. This switch, however, does **not** consider and determine a timing to switch, and is **not** made according to a judged operation of the user in inputting command. Therefore, Damiani also fails to describe that the processing unit 7 determines **a timing to shift** between a process of displaying the operation menu using the first menu information and a process of displaying the operation menu using the second menu information, **according to the judged operation of the user in inputting command**, as described in claim 1.

Accordingly, even if Morimoto is modified by Damiani, the combination still fails to disclose a display control unit that **determines**, **based upon the operation of the user in inputting command**, **a timing to shift** from a process of displaying the operation menu using the first menu information to a process of displaying the operation menu using the second menu information, as described in claim 1. Consequently, the obviousness rejection based on Morimoto and Damiani is untenable and should be withdrawn. Favorable reconsideration of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 18 includes descriptions substantially similar to those of claim 1. Accordingly, claim 18 is patentable over Morimoto and Damiani for at least the same reasons as for claim 1.

Claims 3-5, 9, 10, 12, 13, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1 and include every limitation thereof. Therefore, claims 3-5, 9, 10, 12, 13 are patentable over Morimoto and Damiani by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1 as well as based on their own merits.

Claims 6, 8 and 11, directly or indirectly, depend on claim 1, and are rejected as being unpatentable over Morimoto in view of Damiani, and further in view of Oishi or Entenmann. As discussed earlier relative to claim 1, the combination of Morimoto and Damiani does not meet every limitation of claim 1. The additional documents, Oishi and Entenmann, are cited for their respective purported descriptions relating to using a steering sensor for detecting an operating condition of the steering wheel, and predicting an imminent driving task that is not above a threshold. They do not teach a display control unit that **determines**, **based upon the operation of the user in inputting command**, **a timing to shift** from a process of displaying the operation menu using the first menu information to a process of displaying the operation menu using the second menu information, as described in claim 1. Hence, Oishi and Entenmann, do not alleviate the deficiency of the combination of Morimoto and Damiani. Accordingly, even if Morimoto and Damiani are further combined with Oishi or Entenmann, the combinations still fail to meet every limitation of claim 1. Consequently, claims 6, 8 and 11, are patentable over the combinations of Morimoto and Damiani with Oishi or Entenmann, by virtue of their dependencies from claim 1. Favorable reconsideration of claims 6, 8 and 11 is respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

For the reasons given above, Applicants believe that this application is in condition for allowance, and request that the Examiner give the application favorable reconsideration and permit it to issue as a patent. If the Examiner believes that the application can be put in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants representatives listed below.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 500417 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

Wei-Chen Nicholas Chen
Registration No. 56,665

600 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3096
Phone: 202.756.8000 WC:pab
Facsimile: 202.756.8087
**Date: October 3, 2007**

**Please recognize our Customer No. 20277 as our correspondence address.**

WDC99 1471111-2.050195.0413